

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) For Authority to, Among Other Things, Increase Its Authorized Revenues For Electric Service in 2006, And to Reflect That Increase in Rates.

Application 04-12-014  
(Filed December 21, 2004)

Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Rates, Operations, Practices, Service and Facilities of Southern California Edison Company.

Investigation 05-05-024  
(Filed May 26, 2005)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING  
REGARDING EXHIBITS**

On August 1, 2005, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) electronically served the Comparison Exhibit on all parties. In an electronic mail note sent the same day, SCE noted that an exhibit number had not been pre-designated for the Comparison Exhibit, requested the Comparison Exhibit be assigned an exhibit number, and requested that it be received into evidence so that parties may cite it in their post-hearing briefs. SCE's requests are consistent with past practices and should be granted.

On August 2, 2005, the Alliance for Retail Energy Markets (AReM) sent an electronic mail note to me requesting that SCE's revised response to AReM Data Request 01, Question 1, be assigned an exhibit number and entered into the record so that it can be cited in briefs. AReM indicated that SCE had no objection

to the request. SCE's original response to AReM Data Request 01, Question 1, was identified as Exhibit 801 and received into evidence on June 29, 2005.

AReM's request to also have the revised response entered into the record is reasonable and should be granted.

On August 8, 2005, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) sent a letter addressed to me indicating that the copy of the Prepared Direct Testimony of Deborah Yee identified as Exhibit 725 and received into evidence on July 14, 2005 did not contain six attachments referenced in that prepared testimony. In its letter, SDG&E noted that the prepared testimony and Attachments I through VI had been served on all parties on May 6, 2005. Revisions to the prepared testimony and Attachment II were served as errata on June 30, 2005. Based on the May 6 testimony and attachments and the June 30 errata, all parties waived cross examination of SDG&E witness Yee. SDG&E's request that Exhibit 725 be corrected to include the six attachments is reasonable and should be granted.

In reviewing the transcripts, I was unable to locate references to the receipt into evidence of Exhibits 121, 124, 125, and 706. Exhibit 121 reflects a minor correction to the joint testimony of SCE witnesses Lee and Silsbee contained in Exhibit 113. Exhibits 124 and 125 reflect minor corrections to Silsbee's testimony contained in Exhibits 96 and 77. Exhibit 706 is an SDG&E cross-examination exhibit that SCE and SDG&E agreed to enter into the record in lieu of SDG&E's cross-examination of SCE witness Dominski. During evidentiary hearing, there were no indications that any party objected to the receipt into evidence of any of these exhibits. They should now be included as part of the formal record.

**IT IS RULED** that:

1. The Comparison Exhibit that was served on August 1, 2005 is identified as Exhibit 899 and is received into evidence.

2. Southern California Edison Company's revised response to the Alliance for Retail Energy Market's Data Request 1, Question 1 is identified as Exhibit 801 A and is received into evidence.

3. The Prepared Direct Testimony of Deborah Yee on Behalf of San Diego Gas & Electric Company and the associated Attachments I through VI, all of which were served on May 6, 2005, as revised by the errata served on June 30, 2005, are identified as Exhibit 725 (revised). Exhibit 725 (revised) supersedes Exhibit 725, and is received into evidence.

4. Exhibits 121, 124, 125 and 706 are received into evidence.

Dated August 9, 2005, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ DAVID K. FUKUTOME

David K. Fukutome  
Administrative Law Judge

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have by mail, and by electronic mail to the parties for whom an electronic mail address has been provided, this day served a true copy of the original attached Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Regarding Exhibits on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record.

Dated August 9, 2005, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ FANNIE SID

---

Fannie Sid

## **N O T I C E**

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.